

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended, and new Claims 9 - 11 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 1 - 11 remain in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as claim amendments in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. Rejections under 35 U. S. C. §102(b)

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated April 7, 2008, states that Claims 1 - 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,295,457 to Narayanaswamy. This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to more fully describe the predefined algorithm by which either the first connection or the second connection is selected. Names are stored at the mobile device. Telephone numbers associated with each name are stored at the base station. The associated numbers are stored in a preference order. The first telephone number in the order is called using the first connection if the telephone number is associated with the circuit switched telephone network and the second connection if the telephone number is associated with the packet network.

Narayanaswamy discloses a base station that may connect with either a data network or PSTN. Narayanaswamy does NOT teach, suggest or disclose the use of a preference order for telephone numbers associated with a name.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is deemed patentable over Narayanaswamy. Dependent Claims 2 - 9 are therefore deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of Claim 1 from which they depend.

Independent Claim 10 also recites the use of a preference order for telephone numbers associated with a name. Accordingly, Claim 10 distinguishes over Narayanaswamy. Dependent Claim 11 is deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of Claim 10, from which is depends.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Cust. Nbr. for Corr.: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586; Fax: 407-343-7587

Marcia L. Doubet, Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 40,999